

## REMARKS

Claims 27-50, 54-58 and 59-84 are now pending in the application. Claims 26-50 and 54-83 stand rejected. Claim "58b" has been cancelled herein, Claim 84 is new, and Claim 69 has been amended to overcome an informality. Support for the amendments and new claim can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments, new claim and remarks contained herein.

## APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for speaking with Applicants' representative on January 18, 2008. In this teleconference, Claim 27 was discussed, along with the two cited references. No agreement was reached, however, the Examiner did indicate that she would contact the undersigned at a later date if it would help.

## CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants have amended Claim 69 to overcome an informality. Applicants have also added new Claim 84, which includes the subject matter of cancelled Claim 58 (page 10). In this regard, the preliminary amendment included two claims numbered 58. The second claim numbered 58 (on page 10) has been cancelled herein and renumbered as Claim 84. Applicants submit these changes do not add any new limitations, but merely place these claims in condition for allowance.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 58 (page 9) and 58 (page 10) stand objected to for having the same claim number. Applicants have cancelled Claim 58 (page 10) and have added Claim 84, which includes the subject matter of this claim. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 26-50 and 54-80 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-55 of Jascob (U.S. Pat. No. 6,636,757; hereinafter "Jascob"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Terminal Disclaimer filed on July 30, 2007 renders this rejection moot, and Applicants request that the Examiner remove this double-patenting rejection.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27-50 and 54-83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kienzle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,285,902; hereinafter "Kienzle") in view of Munger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,352,363; hereinafter "Munger"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit herewith a declaration and the evidence required under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 to prove that the present application was conceived and reduced to practice prior to January 16, 2001, the filing date of Munger. With Munger removed as prior art, Applicants submit that Claims 27-50 and 54-84 define over the prior art of

record. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejections to Claims 27-50 and 54-84 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2008

By:

  
Richard W. Warner, Reg. No. 38,043  
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

RWW/EKS/chs